



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

12

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/019,330	03/07/2002	Mihaly Toth	44201757 PAR	6246
2512	7590	08/09/2006	EXAMINER	
PERMAN & GREEN 425 POST ROAD FAIRFIELD, CT 06824			AVELLINO, JOSEPH E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2143	

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/019,330

Applicant(s)

TOTH ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph E. Avellino

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-22 are presented for examination; claims 1, 18, 21, and 22 independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bayeh et al. (USPN 6,098,093) (hereinafter Bayeh) in view of Freund et al. (USPN 5,925,098) (hereinafter Freund).

3. Referring to claim 1, Bayeh discloses a method of managing a plurality of sessions (e.g. abstract), the sessions being between a plurality of terminals and a server (i.e. web server and client) and a server having a plurality of threads (i.e. servlets containing a plurality of servlet threads) the method comprising:

routing the sessions to a plurality of web servers (i.e. sending the client requests to a web server based on a load balancing algorithm provided by the host 59) (col. 8, lines 50-55);

assigning a servlet to each web server which provides session services (since each servlet contains at least one servlet thread, this satisfies the limitation of assigning a thread to the web server sessions) (col. 8, lines 42-67).

Bayeh does not specifically state grouping the sessions into a plurality of groups, rather routing the sessions to the web servers based on a load-balancing algorithm. In analogous art, Freund discloses another method of managing a plurality of sessions which discloses assigning sessions to a group (i.e. client requests are divided amongst queues based on the type of transaction) (e.g. abstract; Figure 2; col. 5, lines 1-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Bayeh with Freund since Bayeh discloses that load-balancing techniques are known in the art (col. 8, lines 56-57). This would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to search for methods of session distribution between servers, eventually finding Freund and its novel method of utilizing multiple queues for request transaction type for transaction processing, thus providing the same execution environment for each transactionally related request as supported by Freund (col. 5, lines 25-27).

4. Referring to claims 2 and 3, Bayeh discloses the grouping occurs when a session is created or becomes active (it is understood that when a session is created, it is inherently becoming active) (col. 8, lines 42-58).

5. Referring to claim 4, Bayeh discloses one group is provided for each thread, such that there are equal numbers of groups and threads (i.e. equal numbers of groups, which are web servers receiving requests, and threads, which are servlet engines which will participate in the session management solution) (col. 8, lines 59-67).

6. Referring to claim 5, Bayeh discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 1. Bayeh does not specifically disclose the sessions are assigned statically to particular threads, however does state that load-balancing techniques are well known in the art (col. 8, lines 55-58). This would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to search for load balancing techniques in which static assignment techniques (i.e. based on client's IP address or round-robin technique) are well known in the art. By this rationale, "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing for static load balancing techniques are well known and expected in the art. It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Bayeh to incorporate static load balancing techniques in order to easily route requests between entities, without undue processing and thereby increasing throughput and reducing overall system overhead.

7. Referring to claim 6, Bayeh discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 1. Bayeh does not specifically state a session is put into a first group in a first time period before suspension and put into a second group in a second time period following resumption, however when a session resumes, it will be processed by the front-end processor as it was a new session connection, and will be routed as required by the host 59, it will then be routed to a second group which may or may not be the same as the first group. By this rationale it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to understand that a session is put into a first group in a first time period

Art Unit: 2143

before suspension and put into a second group in a second time period following resumption to simplify connection processing and reduce overall system overhead.

8. Referring to claim 7, Bayeh discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 6 above. Bayeh does not specifically state the second group is chosen on the basis of activity levels, however does disclose the sessions are assigned based on the relative levels of particular threads, however does state that load-balancing techniques are well known in the art (col. 8, lines 55-58). This would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to search for load balancing techniques in which incorporate load balancing assignment techniques (i.e. round-robin, percentage of activity monitored, etc.) are well known in the art. By this rationale, "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing for relative load balancing techniques are well known and expected in the art. It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Bayeh to incorporate load balancing techniques in order to easily route requests between entities efficiently, and effectively utilize processing time in order to maximize throughput of the system.

9. Referring to claim 8, Bayeh discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 6 above. Bayeh does not specifically state the second group is chosen on the basis of activity levels, however does disclose the sessions are assigned randomly to particular threads, however does state that load-balancing techniques are well known in the art (col. 8, lines 55-58). This would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to search for

load balancing techniques in which incorporate random load balancing assignment techniques which are well known in the art. By this rationale, "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing for random load balancing techniques are well known and expected in the art. It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Bayeh to incorporate random load balancing techniques in order to easily route requests between entities efficiently, reducing processing overhead by not requiring monitoring software for the processes, thereby increasing throughput and availability of the system.

10. Referring to claim 9, Bayeh discloses each group has a queue and each session puts its events into that queue (col. 12, line 29-58).

11. Referring to claim 10, Bayeh discloses the sessions are grouped by a thread referred to as an acceptor thread (i.e. load balancing process (col. 8, lines 42-58).

12. Referring to claim 11, Bayeh discloses the acceptor thread calls a function which is answered by a notification that a new session has been created and then assigns the new session to a particular session group (col. 8, lines 43-57).

13. Referring to claim 12, Bayeh discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 1. Bayeh does not specifically disclose the sessions remain open for an

Art Unit: 2143

undetermined period of time until closed, however it is well known that clients can close sessions on their own using HTTP (i.e. HTTP CLOSE function). By this rationale, "Official Notice" that both the concepts and advantages of providing for sessions which remain open until closed is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Bayeh to include sessions which remain open until closed in order to conform to the HTTP protocol and allow computers which conform to this protocol to effectively manage their own sessions.

14. Referring to claims 13 and 14, Bayeh discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 1. Bayeh does not specifically disclose the terminals are mobile terminals and cellular telephones, however it is well known that wireless mobile terminals and cellular telephones can act as client devices and request information from servers. By this rationale, "Official Notice" that both the concepts and advantages of providing for cellular telephones and mobile terminals as the terminals is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Bayeh to include cellular phones as the terminals to allow the system to be accessed by a plurality of different entities, thereby providing a bigger market for the system and allowing more clients to access the system, and further increase customer satisfaction.

15. Referring to claim 15, Bayeh discloses load balancing means is included in the assignment mechanism of the session (col. 8, lines 42-58).

16. Referring to claim 16, Bayeh discloses the sessions involve obtaining information or conducting transactions through the Internet (col. 8, lines 20-41).

17. Referring to claim 17, Bayeh discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 1. Bayeh does not specifically disclose the sessions are part of the Wireless Session Protocol (WSP), however the WSP is well known to easily provide session service from mobile devices to web servers and allow mobile terminals to access the Internet. By this rationale, "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing for using the WSP protocol for sessions is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide using the WSP for the devices in order to allow mobile devices to access the service, thereby allowing more clients to access the system, and further increase customer satisfaction.

18. Claims 18-22 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments filed July 10, 2006 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Art Unit: 2143

20. In the remarks, Applicant argues, in substance, that (1) Freund does not disclose grouping sessions, rather that transactions are grouped together.

21. As to point (1), Applicant's recitation of cited passages of the references are correct, however one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the benefits of utilizing the sessions of Bayeh with the queue assignment techniques described in Freund. By utilizing the queue assignment techniques of Freund to assign sessions to particular web servers, servlets and threads, the system of Bayeh is enhanced by allowing each session to be executed in the same environment as before, resulting in reduced overhead processing for the servers.

Conclusion

22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

23. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2143

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

24. Applicant has failed to seasonably challenge the Examiner's assertions of well known subject matter in the previous Office action(s) pursuant to the requirements set forth under MPEP §2144.03. A "seasonable challenge" is an explicit demand for evidence set forth by Applicant in the next response. Accordingly, the claim limitations the Examiner considered as "well known" in the first Office action are now established as admitted prior art of record for the course of the prosecution. See *In re Chevenard*, 139 F.2d 71, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph E. Avellino whose telephone number is (571) 272-3905. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00-4:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2143

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



JEA
July 19, 2006



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100